



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/810,302

03/26/2004

Nhut Nguyen

2003.10.010.NS0

8022

23990

7590

02/04/2009

DOCKET CLERK

P.O. DRAWER 800889

DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER

PHUNG, LUAT

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2416

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/04/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's arguments filed on November 5, 2008 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

2. On page 10, Applicants argue that:

The VoIP calls are not directed to the gatekeeper 14 of Baj. The gatekeeper 14 merely routes the calls.

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As a recap of the rejection of claim 1, Baj discloses configured to receive a test call initiation message directed to the test controller from an originating terminal (VoIP client (call originator) per Fig. 2, element 21; VoIP client executes call initiation script, i.e. test call initiation message, to make call and gatekeeper route incoming VoIP call to specified destination per para. 27, 31; Fig. 1; para. 26-29; VoIP call from client server 20 goes to gatekeeper which provides call-control services and routes calls to one of gateways; test tool receiving command, i.e., test call initiation message, from PC; para. 39; VoIP client initially sending a request to establish transmission path for testing voice quality of VoIP network)

Furthermore Goodman from the same or similar fields of endeavor discloses an initiator test probe initiating a test call by dialing a phone number to the other test probe by having the call received at the VoIP gateway, i.e., test controller, which directs the call over the VoIP network, using VoIP protocols such as H.323, SIP and MGCP. (col. 3, lines 52+; col. 5, lines 34-46).

3. On page 11, Applicants argue that:

Bai does not disclose a test call origination message as recited in Claim 1.

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As a recap of the rejection of claim 1, Bai discloses configured to receive a test call initiation message directed to the test controller from an originating terminal (VoIP client (call originator) per Fig. 2, element 21; VoIP client executes call initiation script, i.e. test call initiation message, to make call and gatekeeper route incoming VoIP call to specified destination per para. 27, 31; Fig. 1; para. 26-29; VoIP call from client server 20 goes to gatekeeper which provides call-control services and routes calls to one of gateways; test tool receiving command, i.e., test call initiation message, from PC; para. 39; VoIP client initially sending a request to establish transmission path for testing voice quality of VoIP network)

4. On page 12, Applicants argue that:

The Applicants are unable to find any teaching or suggestion in Bai that the gateway 13b comprises a plurality of voice paths.

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As a recap of the rejection of claim 1, Bai discloses allocate one of the voice paths within the telecommunication device for a test call based on the test call initiation message (para. 27, 33, 34; establishing transmission path by gateway between VoIP client and destination phone; VoIP client executing call initiation scripts to place a series of calls through gateway, i.e., plurality of voice paths within the gateway)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 2416

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. Claims 1-18 and 20-24 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baj (US 2002/0145979) in view of Goodman (US 7,173,910).

Regarding **claims 1 and 9**, Baj discloses for use in a telecommunication network, an apparatus for testing a telecommunication device comprising switching fabric including a plurality of voice paths (system for testing hardware module in VoIP network path per abstract), said apparatus comprising:

a test controller (gatekeeper per Fig. 2, element 14; test tool 22 per Fig. 1 and para. 29) configured to receive a test call initiation message directed to the test controller from an originating terminal (VoIP client (call originator) per Fig. 2, element 21; VoIP client executes call initiation script, i.e. test call initiation message, to make call and gatekeeper route incoming VoIP call to specified destination per para. 27, 31; Fig. 1; para. 26-29; VoIP call from client server 20 goes to gatekeeper which provides call-control services and routes calls to one of gateways; test tool receiving command, i.e., test call initiation message, from PC; para. 39; VoIP client initially sending a request to establish transmission path for testing voice quality of VoIP network), to prompt the telecommunication device (gateway per Fig. 2, element 13b; gatekeeper route incoming call to one of gateways per para. 27; it is well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that the gatekeeper interfaces with the gateway to establish communications paths via standards VoIP protocols such as H.323, MGCP and RTP) to allocate one of the voice paths within the telecommunication device for a test call based on the test call initiation message (para. 27, 33, 34; establishing transmission path by gateway between VoIP client and destination phone; VoIP client executing call initiation scripts to place a series of calls through gateway, i.e., plurality of voice paths within the gateway), and to establish a call connection for the test call between the originating

Art Unit: 2416

terminal and a destination terminal via the allocated voice path and a packet-switched network to test the allocated voice path. (first establishing a transmission path between the VoIP client and destination phone, then testing the quality of voice transmissions per para. 31, 34)

Baj discloses all of the subject matter as recited above. However, assuming in arguendo Baj does not disclose a test call initiation message directed to the test controller. Goodman from the same or similar fields of endeavor discloses an initiator test probe initiating a test call by dialing a phone number to the other test probe by having the call received at the VoIP gateway, i.e., test controller, which directs the call over the VoIP network, using VoIP protocols such as H.323, SIP and MGCP. (col. 3, lines 52+; col. 5, lines 34-46). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have a terminal generating a test call to the test controller as suggested by Goodman in the test environment of Baj. The motivation for doing so would have been to use an established standard configuration for VoIP communications.

Regarding **claims 2 and 10**, Baj further discloses wherein the voice paths comprise time division multiplexed (TDM) switched circuits (PSTN per Fig. 2 and para. 26).

Regarding **claims 3 and 13**, Baj discloses all of the subject matter except wherein the originating terminal and the destination terminal are Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) phones. Goodman from the same or similar fields of endeavor discloses wherein the originating terminal and the destination terminal are Session Initiation

Art Unit: 2416

Protocol (SIP) phones (col. 5, lines 1-46; test probe supporting SIP instead of or in addition to H.323). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use SIP phones as suggested by Goodman in Baj's network. The motivation for doing so would have been to use a powerful standard for VoIP communications.

Regarding **claims 4 and 14**, Baj further discloses the test call initiation message being addressed to an Internet Protocol (IP) address of the test controller (gatekeeper connected to Internet, identified by IP address per Fig. 2; para. 27).

Regarding **claims 5 and 15**, Baj discloses all of the subject matter except wherein the test call origination message is an INVITE message. Goodman from the same or similar fields of endeavor discloses using SIP for generating test calls (col. 5, lines 1-46). It is well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that an INVITE message is used to initiate a call. Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the SIP message to originate the test call as suggested by Goodman, specifically the INVITE message, in Baj's network. The motivation for doing so would have been to use a powerful standard for VoIP communications.

Regarding **claims 6 and 16**, Baj further discloses wherein the test controller is configured to send a signaling message to an IP address of the destination terminal (para. 27).

Regarding **claims 7 and 17**, Baj further discloses wherein the test controller is configured to send a signaling message to a device controller within the

Art Unit: 2416

telecommunication device, the device controller allocating the allocated voice path (para. 27).

Regarding **claims 8 and 11**, Baj further discloses wherein the allocated voice path provides a connection to a media gateway for converting between circuit-switched voice and packet-switched voice (conversion of media formats by gateways per para. 27).

Regarding **claim 12**, Baj further discloses the telecommunications system as set forth in claim 9, wherein the telecommunication device comprises:

switching fabric including a plurality of voice circuits for switching voice calls (para. 27-36); and

a controller operable to receive a signaling message from the test controller to establish the call connection for the test call through the packet-switched network, the controller being further operable to allocate one of the voice circuits for the test call to test the allocated voice circuit (para. 27-36).

Regarding **claim 18**, Baj further discloses wherein the telecommunication device is a switch (gateway per para. 33).

Claims 20, 21 and 22-24 are method claims corresponding to apparatus claims 1, 8 and 4-6, respectively, and are therefore rejected under the same reason set forth in the rejection of claims 1, 8 and 4-6, respectively.

9. Claim 19 is rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baj in view of Goodman, and further in view of Dorenbosch, et al (US Pub 2002/0114317).

Art Unit: 2416

Regarding **claim 19**, the combination of Baj and Goodman discloses all of the subject matter as previously recited in this office action except wherein the switch is a mobile switching center. Dorenbosch from the same or similar fields of endeavor discloses system comprising an MSC (Fig. 3, element 302) communicating with a SIP peer/server (Fig. 3, element 206). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the network of Baj and Goodman with the MSC of Dorenbosch by replacing the gateway with the MSC. The motivation for the combination would have been to support testing a voice path on a wireless system.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure (see form 892).

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LUAT PHUNG whose telephone number is (571) 270-3126. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30 AM - 5:00 PM, F 7:30 AM - 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Q. Ngo can be reached on 571-272-3139. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2416

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/L. P./

Examiner, Art Unit 2416

/Ricky Ngo/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2416